

BWA01

.W3A3

*Special District Meeting
at Manchester, Oct. 1884.*

by Dr Warren.

BW401

.W3 A3

Wesley Memorial Library

Thursfield Smith Collection
of
Wesleyana



Atlanta, - Georgia

Wes. 1450

1834

AN
ACCOUNT
OF THE
PROCEEDINGS
OF A
SPECIAL DISTRICT MEETING,
HELD IN
MANCHESTER,

OCTOBER 22ND AND 23RD, 1834.

BY SAMUEL WARREN, LL.D.

Justum et tenacem propositi virum
Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
Non vultus instantis TYRANNI
Mente quatit solida,—

Hor.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL.

SOLD BY JAMES EVERETT STOREY, MANCHESTER;
AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

MDCCCXXXIV

BW 401

.W3 A3

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

J. Thompson (late Everett & Thompson), Printer,
30, New Cannon-street, Manchester.

Wes. 1450

AN ACCOUNT, &c.

TO prevent any misapprehension of the subject proposed, not only in the present publication, but also in that of the "REMARKS ON THE WESLEYAN THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION," lately published, it is thought proper at once to state; That the Author's deep and permanent conviction has for some time been, that such an ascendancy has long been sought, and actually gained, by a certain party in the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion, as is utterly inconsistent with the liberties of the People, and of the Preachers, and the just and impartial administration of Methodistic Law, as instituted in the public and accredited Rules and Regulations of the Body. It is too obvious to be denied, that many of these Rules and Regulations have been either disregarded, or violated, to the no small annoyance and injury of various Societies, and of individuals, as the dominant party has directed, in defiance of all remonstrance from those who have been aggrieved, whilst the aggressors have endeavoured to shelter their proceedings from public obloquy, by perversion of Rule, or sophistical statements.

The facts, therefore, which have been detailed in the "REMARKS," and not one of which has yet been successfully controverted, whilst they furnish sufficient reasons why the THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION ought to be immediately discontinued, are powerful arguments to enforce a diligent investigation of the *practice*, as contradistinguished from the *principles* of Methodism, and a strenuous effort to effect a thorough reformation of

abuses which threaten to destroy its usefulness, and dissolve its unity. Let it not, therefore, for a moment, be lost sight of, in the present contest, that whatever diversity of opinion may be entertained on some of the subordinate details, the main point to which it looks forward and directs its energy is, the better understanding of the original and accredited terms of our union, as a Body of professing christians, and an impartial and faithful administration of the Constitution to which both the People, and the Preachers have agreed.

That no Community, whether civil or religious, can long or prosperously hang together without the exercise of discipline, and a faithful adherence to acknowledged laws and regulations, is too plain to need proof: and, that in proportion as those laws and regulations are just and equitable, so will be the probable degree of harmony, peace, and prosperity of those who consent to be governed by them, will, perhaps, be as easily admitted as the former assumption. But of all the provocations which can generate dissatisfaction, and exasperate contention, none surely can be conceived more powerful, than that of having possession of good and wholesome laws and regulations, and hearing large and loud professions of their faithful administration, whilst common observation and common sense are outraged by a shameless violation of them.

Connected with the publication of the Pamphlet already alluded to, certain proceedings have been instituted against its Author, under the profession of bringing him to an account, on the principles of justice and righteousness, for his unconstitutional conduct. How far these pretensions can be sustained, will now be submitted to the judgment of the Wesleyan Connexion at large; and let them, in the first instance, and every British heart in the next, say, Whether the sentence of

Suspension from the exercise of the functions of the Christian Ministry—the utmost severity which a Wesleyan Methodist District Meeting could inflict, even in a case of the most consummate villany—was justly merited by the conduct of Samuel Warren.

For the sake of order it may be convenient to notice, How far the alleged complaints warranted the calling of a Special District Meeting on my case; whether the proceedings of that Meeting were Constitutional; and whether the sentence pronounced by it was just and equitable.

THE *first* of these enquiries will receive the readiest solution, by introducing at once a copy of the Charges preferred against me. These were conveyed in the following envelope:

Dear Doctor,

The enclosed charges having been preferred against you by the Rev. John Anderson, it is my duty to give you notice to attend a Special District Meeting to answer to the said charges. The Meeting is appointed for Wednesday, the 22nd., inst., to commence at ten o'clock in the morning, in the Stewards' Room, Oldham-street. I have requested the President of the Conference to preside on the occasion.

I am, yours faithfully,

ROBERT NEWTON.

*To the Rev. Dr. Warren,
Oldham-street, Manchester, Oct. 11, 1834.*

THE CHARGES.

I. That Dr. Warren, by the publication of his pamphlet entitled, "Remarks on the Wesleyan Theo-

logical Institution, for the Improvement of the Junior Preachers," has violated the essential principles of our Connexion.

II. That the said Pamphlet, contains sundry incorrect statements, and misrepresentations of facts, highly prejudicial to the general character of the Body.

III. That the Pamphlet contains also, certain calumnious and unfounded reflections upon the character and proceedings of the Conference; and on the motives and conduct of individual Preachers.

IV. That the said Pamphlet is distinguished by a spirit of r  s  ntment and uncharitableness, highly unbecoming the character of a Christian Minister, and obviously tending to produce strife and division in our Societies.

In the first of these extraordinary Charges, as well, indeed, as in *each* of them separately, not one single act of transgression is specified. Unless, therefore, the mere circumstance of having published a Pamphlet entitled, "Remarks on the Wesleyan Theological Institution, for the Improvement of the Junior Preachers," be a "violation of the essential principles of our Connexion," there is nothing whatever in this Charge which applies to me, any more than the mere publication of a Pamphlet, just at the same time, by the Rev. Thomas Jackson, "On the Church and the Methodists, being the substance of a Speech delivered to the Wesleyan Conference of 1834," was "a violation of the essential principles of our Connexion." Who, from any thing which appears to the contrary, in this perfect model of indictments, can possibly devise, whether my Pamphlet is not one of the most laudatory recommendations of the Institution to the cordial and universal support of the Connexion?

Tell me not, that the *specific* charges would have been made out during the trial, as they might have been selected at the time. I know of no single sentence in the whole Pamphlet, on which such a charge as is mentioned in the first count, can be sustained. How then could I have prepared my defence? Of the same kind precisely, is each of the following Charges. No one act whatever is specified, as will be seen on inspection, by which any "Statement is said to be incorrect, or fact misrepresented, or prejudice done to the general character of the Body."—In what part of the Pamphlet are "Calumnious and unfounded reflections upon the character and proceedings of the Conference to be found, and upon the motives and conduct of individual Preachers?" Who are the Preachers thus calumniated? What are their names?—Which are the expressions so "Distinguished by a spirit of resentment and uncharitableness, so highly unbecoming the character of a christian Minister, and so obviously tending to produce strife and division in our Societies?"

Let the common sense of the whole Connexion say,—Let the voice of the British Public say, whether any just proceedings, in the way of trial at all,—and especially a trial in which my very existence as a christian Minister was placed in peril—could be instituted upon such Charges as this precious document presents? What must the universal opinion be, of the competency of the REV. JOHN ANDERSON, Superintendent of the Third Manchester Circuit, to assume the new character of *Attorney General*, as my Accuser, when he has neither sufficient wit or knowledge to draw up even an Indictment, so as to be able to proceed one step in my trial: and this too, with all the counsel and assistance of the Rev. Robert Newton, the Rev. Edmund Grindrod, the Rev. John Hanwell, the Rev. Jonathan Crowther, the

Rev. Joseph Hollingworth, and of other divines not a few. Yet, from such a counsel as this, and with this hopeful beginning, the far famed Manchester Special District Meeting proceeded, without farther evidence, to inflict the highest possible penalty upon its victim, for the crime of treating its Charges with merited contempt!

BUT what if, turning from the Charges, we direct our attention to the character of the Judges, who were to deliberate and pronounce sentence?—In the first place, instead of the regular Chairman of the District, appointed at the Conference to preside on all such occasions, the *Rev. Joseph Taylor*, President of the Conference, is sent for from London, to sit in judgment upon me;—the very same personage before whose bar at the Conference, I was treated with so much *justice* and *mercy*, when I was endeavouring to clear myself of the foul aspersions cast upon me by the Rev. Jabez Bunting. Was ever a more complete piece of Jefferyism played off, since Judge Jefferies went to his own place! It is, however, due to the President to notice, that he was not wholly unconscious of the unseemliness of his situation, and of the opinion which might *possibly* go forth concerning it. He therefore addressed the Meeting in a short speech on the subject, and “begged that the Brethren would endeavour to leave *him* out of their thoughts on the case before them, although personally concerned, and confine themselves to the consideration of matter of fact.” This, then, was the person appointed to be my chief Judge.

Next in order and in dignity, was the Rev. Robert Newton, Chairman of the Manchester District; the very individual whose insulting communication to me, during one of the sittings of the Conference, furnished

the chief argument for publishing my pamphlet, telling me "that all the Brethren said, had I only been proposed to fill one of the offices in the Institution, they should never have heard of my opposition:"—and this too, when the communication could not by possibility have served any other purpose than that of lacerating my feelings, as the debate had been closed for two or three days, and I had sunk down into perfect quietness. This disinterested person also, was now to perform the part of one of my Judges; and on a capital Indictment.

Another of my Judges, was the remarkable Jonathan Crowther, with the whole weight and circumstance of his *Dictionary-learning*, combined with that secretness of disposition which characterizes his compositions, and breathes through almost every line of his lately written pamphlet. That it has fallen short of the mark at which it aimed, is the fault neither of the eye, nor of the heart of him who drew the bow, but the feebleness of his arm.—Such, however, is the fact, that this individual, who has evidently drawn together all the little resources of his *pedagogical lore*, and combined whatever assistance he could call in from his Brethren in the Ministry; and especially the supervision and correction of his *Reverend protégé*, in order to convict me of falsehood, and render me obnoxious to the condemnation and heaviest punishment of a Methodistical Court:—this remarkable scholar, gentleman, and christian, is also, on this memorable trial, constituted one of my Judges. I say nothing of the amiable Mr. Grindrod, who was on the other side of the Atlantic, transacting *important negociations* in Upper Canada, when most of these events transpired;* nor of the mild and benignant Mr. John

* Is it not somewhat remarkable, that the Faculty of "Wesley College" in America, in their liberality of conferring Degrees, should have

Anderson, who was at once my chief *Accuser*, and another of my *Judges*!

A FEW words may, perhaps, be allowed relative to *Witnesses*. Under this head I shall give merely what passed in the District Meeting on the morning of Wednesday, October the 22nd., 1834,—the day on which my trial commenced. What follows is transcribed from my Manuscript, and that of my Friend, the Rev. James Bromley, which were written *immediately* after retiring from the District Meeting, lest any inaccuracy should result from delay.

“Immediately after prayer, the Secretary of the Conference, the Rev. Robert Newton, requested permission of the Meeting, that the Rev. Mr. Mc. Donald, then in Manchester, although not a preacher in this District, might be permitted to be present during the trial. To this the Meeting readily consented. Dr. Warren then asked the same privilege for a friend of his; stating that although he also was not a preacher in this District, yet he was a preacher in full connexion, and one who was present during the late Conference. To this also consent was given. Messrs. Mc. Donald, and Bromley, were accordingly admitted without any further conversation on the subject. The latter of these Gentlemen, on entering the room, courteously paid his respects, first to the President, then to several of the Brethren, and lastly took his seat on the left hand of his Friend, Dr. Warren. Mr. Grindrod then rose and objected that Mr. Bromley should be present in that Meeting as a witness, or as a counsel to Dr. Warren.

overlooked the Rev. Edmund Grindrod,—an individual who has so greatly *endeared* himself to this country, and lately to America itself, by his skill in Diplomacy,—in not conferring as well on him the equally merited honour of D.D., as upon his *learned* friend Jabez?

It was then required as a further condition, that he should not be permitted to take notes in writing of what passed. To this also Dr. Warren consented. An additional injunction was also made, That Mr. Bromley should not be permitted to speak on any thing connected with the trial about to proceed. Even in this strange proposal the Doctor also acquiesced.

The Minutes of the Conference, relative to the Wesleyan Theological Institution were then read, as was also the whole of Dr. Warren's Pamphlet on the subject. The Charges against the Doctor were then presented by the Rev. John Anderson, and read by the Rev. Jonathan Crowther, the Secretary of the Meeting; to which the Doctor pleaded, not guilty. It was then proposed to him by the President, whether he preferred to have all the four Charges gone through before his reply, or to have them taken up separately. Availing himself of this kind alternative, he said in a *whisper* to his friend Mr. Bromley, "Do you think with me, that it would be preferable to have them all gone through first?"—On Mr. Grindrod's perceiving that Dr. Warren whispered to his friend, he rose and with considerable warmth protested against Mr. Bromley's being permitted to assist the Doctor by acting as his counsel, or even sitting by him. It was stated by the latter, that he was not aware that Mr. Grindrod's interdict went so far as to prohibit even a whisper. All that he understood by it was, that Mr. Bromley should not be permitted to *plead* as Counsel for the Defendant. If, however, this was offensive to the Meeting, the Doctor would consent to forego even this privilege, and that his Friend Mr. Bromley should also remove to another part of the room. On being about to seat himself next to Mr. Grindrod, the latter, with a gesture which strongly indicated the approach of a great nuisance, a

countenance scarcely human or divine, and with an intonation of voice not soon to be forgotten, refused Mr. Bromley the *privilege* of sitting by him.* Finding his proximity to Mr. Grindrod to be so insufferable, he removed to a salutary distance, and selected a situation among others of his Brethren, to whom his contiguity might be less annoying. Thus severed from Dr. Warren, and no longer allowed the privilege of interchanging a word, or even a whisper with him,—although he saw his respected friend and companion upon his trial, on a capital indictment—the following expression of grief and indignation involuntarily escaped his lips into the ear of a preacher who sat next to him, (but even this too was uttered in a whisper)—“*This is consummate cruelty!*” Unfortunately, this expression, which was intended only for the private ear of the individual whom he addressed, was overheard by the Rev. John Anderson, who happened to be next to him. In violation of all the civilities and decencies of society, he immediately published aloud to the whole Meeting what he had thus detected; adding, that Mr. Bromley had abused the courtesy of the Meeting by stigmatizing its proceeding as “consummately cruel,” and he therefore moved, That Mr. Bromley should forthwith be required to withdraw, as business could not proceed whilst he was permitted to be present.

To this Dr. Warren objected, urging that as his friend had been admitted by the express consent of the Meeting, and every requirement which it was thought proper to make had been complied with,—viz: that he should neither take written notes, nor speak, nor whisper, nor even sit in the neighbourhood of his friend whilst on his trial, it was unreasonable and cruel to exclude the only

* For Mr. Bromley's version of this incident, see his Letter in the Appendix.

witness whose presence he had requested. The Secretary of the Conference, Mr. Newton, at first seemed averse to Mr. Anderson's motion; but upon Mr. Grindrod's strenuously seconding and enforcing it, he gave his concurrence. At this moment Dr. Warren, with firmness of speech and manner, spoke the following words; "If my only witness, Mr. Bromley, be not permitted to be present during my trial, after all the unreasonable concessions which have been made, *I do here solemnly declare, that I will not stand my trial before this Meeting,—COME WHAT WILL!*" Notwithstanding this declaration, the motion was put, and carried. As Dr. Warren and Mr. Bromley were about to leave the Meeting, a conversation was induced, in which it was proposed to the Doctor to stand his trial at an adjourned Meeting. An immediate answer was required; which, however, he refused, but promised to give one at three o'clock in the afternoon. Agreeably to this engagement he sent a written answer, of which the following is a copy:

Oldham-street, Manchester,
Oct. 22nd., 1834.

Dear Sir,

After mature deliberation, under existing circumstances, I have come to this final conclusion; that I do not think it my duty to attend any future session of the Special District Meeting called on my case. When you shall have come to your ultimate resolution, be pleased to send it to me in writing to my house.

I am, dear Sir,

Your's most respectfully,

SAMUEL WARREN.

*To the Rev. Joseph Taylor,
President of the Wesleyan
Methodist Conference.*

On the following morning, at half-past nine o'clock, a deputation consisting of Messrs. Newton, Hanwell, Crowther, and Mc. Kitrick, waited upon the Doctor to know, "whether after the repose of the night, and due deliberation," he continued of the same mind as was expressed in his Note of yesterday. To which he replied,—"*Precisely the same.*" He wished, however, to correct a mistake which rumour had circulated,— "That his Note of yesterday was a tender of his resignation." This was furthest from his intention. On the contrary, he now stated most explicitly in the hearing of the Deputation,—what had been his uniform declaration, "That whatever might be the ultimate decision, whether of the District Meeting, or of the Conference, his attachment to the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion would not in the least be shaken, so long as he was permitted to continue even a private member of the Society." The Deputation then retired. "Mr. Bromley was present at the interview."

REVIEWING these remarkable features of the case, let any candid observer say, whether a trial involving such serious consequences could, with any show of reason or justice, be instituted on such an Indictment, by an ACCUSER, and JUDGES, who were themselves most deeply implicated in the Charges preferred against a Defendant, who was not permitted to have one disinterested individual present to witness what passed,—although under the promise that he should neither write a line, nor say one word in his defence, nor be allowed even to sit near him. Can, I ask, so important a trial, thus conducted, be considered as consistent with honest purposes? Can such a method of proceeding be even tolerated in civilized Society? No more let us hear of the peculiar constitution of a Methodist District

Meeting, if this one at Manchester is to be considered as a fair specimen! To advert only a few moments more to the sole article of Witness: will it be pretended that no witness, except preachers who are members of the Meeting, shall be allowed to be present at the trial of a preacher, or at any rate that he shall not be allowed to speak, or write, or whisper? To say nothing of the monstrous absurdity of such a supposition, can any thing be more glaringly false in practice? Cases, alas! have not been wanting in the history of Methodism, some of which have fallen under my own observation, where preachers themselves have been placed at the bar of a District Meeting to answer to Charges of gross immorality. What has been the uniform—the *necessary* course pursued in some of these cases? Have not witnesses been introduced, and those too, not merely preachers; but also lay-men, nay even women, servants—whoever might be necessary to the conviction of the guilty? What then, is it come to this, that witnesses in abundance may, in a Methodist District Meeting, be introduced to testify the guilt of an accused person; but not one shall be permitted to bear witness to his innocence! Apply this to the matter in hand. I am solemnly charged and put on my trial to answer the capital crimes of, “Violating the essential principles of the Connexion,—misrepresenting facts prejudicial to the character of the Body,—uttering calumnious and unfounded reflections on the Conference, and the Preachers,—expressing resentment and uncharitableness highly unbecoming a christian minister, producing strife and division in our Societies:” Not one witness, however, shall be allowed to be present, to testify any thing in my favour; or, if present, he shall not be permitted to write a line, or speak a word, or even utter a whisper, on pain of expulsion.—After such

a statement as this, if the Meeting held in Manchester, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 22nd., and 23rd. days of October, in the year of our Lord 1834, is a fair specimen of the justice and equity of the proceedings of a Methodist District Meeting; perish for ever the memory of such Meetings! nor again let them disgrace the annals of civilized Society!

BUT a charge still weightier lies against the proceedings of this celebrated District Meeting. Under show and pretence of administering Methodist Discipline, let us see how these arbiters of the destinies of their Brethren proceed. Against one of its Members is preferred a Charge which affects his very existence as a Minister in the Body,—“*A violation of the essential principles of the Connexion:*” that is to say, a charge of *high treason*, against the Constitution of Methodism! Now, assuming that after due deliberation, “A true Bill” had been found, surely, in order to proceed in the trial with decency, the Prisoner had reason to expect, and the Public to demand, that the Court in which the cause was to be tried, ought to be a lawful one; else could its decisions by no possibility be deemed lawful and Constitutional. How then does the case stand before us?—In order to sit in judgment upon “a violator of the essential principles of the Connexion,” is it not indispensably necessary, that the Judge, and the Jury, should themselves be exempt from the same crime? What is the fact? Why, the very case on which they are called to decide, is one on which the whole Court is found guilty, and that too in the *first instance*, viz. “A violation of the essential principles of the Connexion.” This is rendered notorious by the Publication of the Minutes of the late Conference, in which it most distinctly appears, that THE WESLEYAN

THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION has been established in utter violation of Methodistic law. Agreeably to the Constitution, THE PEOPLE are assured in the most solemn manner, that "No Regulations will be finally confirmed till after a year's consideration, and the knowledge of the sentiments of the Connexion at large, through the medium of all their public Officers."* Yet, in defiance of this solemn promise and Charter of THE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS, the Conference do actually establish and confirm THE WESLEYAN THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION, with all its Rules, Regulations, Officers, and an Executive Committee who are charged to carry "the details of the plan" into "IMMEDIATE EXECUTION," without once consulting "the sentiments of the Connexion at large, through the medium of [any] of their public Officers!"—These then are the persons—the President himself, and the Secretary of the Conference at their head, who are to sit in judgment on "a violator of the essential principles of the Connexion!" Justly may the prisoner in his defence turn upon his Judge and say, in the language of St. Paul, "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man—that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things!"

This, however, is not the heaviest Charge against the District Meeting. Even supposing the Court had not been corrupt, nor the Charges themselves futile, yet was the adjudication, and execution of the highest penalty which they could inflict, TOTALLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL!—In order to bring this part of the subject clearly before the reader, I shall first present a copy of the official document by which I was suspended from the exercise of my Ministerial functions.

* See REGULATIONS made at LEEDS, 1797. MINUTES OF CONFERENCE, Vol. 1. pp. 377, 378.

Manchester, Oct. 23, 1834.

My dear Brother,

As Secretary to the Special District Meeting which has been called upon your case, I am directed to forward to you the following Resolutions, which have been unanimously adopted.

Oct. 23, 1834.

Resolved,

I. That Dr. Warren, by his positive and repeated refusal to take his trial at this District Meeting, has left to the Meeting, however reluctant thus to proceed, no alternative, consistent with the existing laws and usages of the Body, but that of declaring him to be suspended from his office as a Travelling Preacher; and he is hereby suspended accordingly.

II. That, nevertheless, if within a month from the date of these Resolutions, Dr. Warren shall signify to the Chairman of the District his willingness to take his trial before a Special District Meeting, on the charges of which he has received regular and formal notice, the sentence of suspension shall be removed on the assembling of that Meeting, and he shall be allowed to have his trial, without any bar or disadvantage, on account of his present refusal "to attend any future Session" of this District Meeting.

III. That, in case of Dr. Warren's declining to give the required intimation to the Chairman of the District within the period above specified, he shall be considered as being suspended until the next Conference."

I am, my dear Brother,

Your's truly,

J. CROWTHER.

To the Rev. S. Warren, LL. D.

In a matter of such high importance as that of suspending a Minister of the Gospel from the exercise of his Ministry,—and especially when he is unimpeachable on the ground of orthodoxy, morality, and acceptable talents,—the Methodist Constitution has wisely provided, that this solemn act shall not be done clandestinely, by any combination, or through the incompetency of any District Meeting composed of *Preachers only*. THE PEOPLE also, through their chief officers are especially recognized in this solemn transaction. The law of the case is contained in that most important document of Methodistic legislation, “THE PLAN OF GENERAL PACIFICATION,” agreed upon between the Preachers and the People, in the year 1795.—That part of it which refers to the present case is as follows :—

“CONCERNING DISCIPLINE.—If the majority of the Trustees, or the majority of the Stewards and Leaders of any Society, believe that any Preacher appointed for their Circuit, is immoral, erroneous in doctrines, deficient in abilities, or that he has broken any of the rules above-mentioned, [i. e. relative to the administration of the Ordinances of Baptism, and the Lord’s Supper,] they shall have authority to summon the Preachers of the District, and all the Trustees, Stewards, and Leaders of the Circuit, to meet in their Chapel on a day and hour appointed, (sufficient time being given.) The Chairman of the District shall be President of the assembly : and every Preacher, Trustee, Steward, and Leader, shall have a single vote, the Chairman possessing also the casting voice. And if the majority of the meeting judge, that the accused Preacher is immoral, erroneous in doctrines, deficient in abilities, or has broken any of the rules above-mentioned, he shall be considered as removed from that Circuit : and the District-Committee shall, as soon as possible, appoint

another Preacher for that Circuit, instead of the Preacher so removed: and shall determine among themselves how the removed Preacher shall be disposed of till the Conference, and shall have authority to suspend the said Preacher from all public duties, till the Conference, if they judge proper. The District Committee shall also supply, as well as possible, the place of the removed Preacher, till another Preacher be appointed. And the Preacher thus appointed, and all other Preachers, shall be subject to the above mode of trial.—No Preacher shall be *suspended* or removed from his Circuit by *any* District-Committee, except he have the privilege of the trial before-mentioned.”*

This mere statement of the law of the case, is sufficient to convince every intelligent and impartial person, that my *Suspension*, concluded and acted upon, without “the privilege of the trial before-mentioned,” is therefore UNCONSTITUTIONAL, and consequently altogether NULL AND VOID !

As, however, no little ingenuity has been resorted to, in order to perplex this plain case, and mislead the unwary, it may not be unseasonable to furnish a reply to the principal objections so advanced. The *first* is, That the case stated in the above law, supposes the charge, or charges, to have been preferred by the People. This, however, goes only to prove, that what else might have been thought to be the exclusive prerogative of THE PREACHERS, is equally shared by THE PEOPLE, viz. “authority to summons the Preachers of the District,” and to arraign a preacher before their bar, whenever a “majority of the Trustees, or a majority of the Stewards and Leaders believe that any Preacher appointed for their Circuit, is immoral, erroneous in doctrine, deficient in abilities, or has broken any of the *Rules* above-mentioned.” Not merely are the

* Minutes of Conference, Vol. 1. pp. 323, 324.

People here recognised as equal sharers with the Preachers in the authority of summoning a District-Meeting, but also, when assembled, of exercising the same functions, and voting equally with the Preachers; the Chairman only having the peculiar privilege of a casting voice. The whole drift, therefore, of this part of the law is, to establish EQUAL RIGHTS on the part of the People, and of the Preachers, in bringing an accused preacher to trial, and of trying him.—But whether the Preachers, or the People bring the Charge, the concluding sentence and paragraph in the above law incontrovertibly establishes this conclusion, That no “*suspension*” of *any* Preacher between the Conferences, shall take place, without a trial before both the Preachers, and the People, the latter of whom are by this law constituted an indispensable party to this solemn act. “*No* Preacher shall be suspended or removed from his Circuit by *any* District-Committee, except he have the privilege of the trial before-mentioned.”

Nor is the reason of the thing less obvious than the law itself. The law evidently assumes the possibility of a District Committee, composed exclusively of Preachers, being so far interested parties, as to render their decisions partial and unjust. The admission of the People is therefore a wise precaution against any faction, or combination of Preachers in a District Meeting, against an individual Preacher. The case now under consideration is one in point. The charges preferred against me, are obviously expressed as having impugned the honour and integrity of the District Meeting itself; (the very circumstance of their *unanimity* in my suspension, being no inconsiderable presumption that such was the case.) Who, then, it may be asked, were my accusers? Every man in that District Meeting! And who were my Judges? The very same per-

sous who were my accusers ! Unless, therefore, the parties specified in the law—Trustees, Stewards, and Leaders, had been present, there was no disinterested jury whatever present to try the prisoner ; but the very same parties were at once Judge, Accusers, and Jury !

A second perplexity has been introduced by reference to other regulations which seem at variance with the law before explained. Thus for example, a District Committee, composed of Preachers only, is stated to have power, not only to try the Preachers generally, but also the Chairman of the District himself, “and, if found guilty, to *suspend* him from being a Travelling Preacher till the ensuing Conference, or to remove him from the office of a Superintendent, or to depose him from the chair, and to elect another in his place.” Again, it is stated, that “If any Preacher be accused of immorality, the Preacher accused, and his accuser, shall respectively choose two Preachers of their District; and the Chairman of the District shall, with the *four* Preachers chosen as above, try the accused Preacher; and they shall have authority, if he be found guilty, to *suspend* him till the ensuing Conference, if they judge it expedient.” How, it is asked, can the interpretation of the law quoted from “THE PLAN OF PACIFICATION,” be reconciled to the language of the two regulations just given, in which the power of *suspending* a preacher “till the ensuing Conference,” is vested wholly in the Preachers, without any mention whatever of the People being a party to such act? Plainly they are irreconcilable! But the solution of the difficulty is simply this: The former of those laws shows how things were done in the year 1792; the latter, how they were done in 1793; but both these were *previous* to the establishment of the great charter of Methodistic liberty, in THE PLAN OF PACIFICATION, in the year 1795 !

A third expedient employed to keep up the appearance of constitutional proceeding in my suspension, is by an appeal to the *usage* of the Connexion. When, it is asked, with an air of triumph, has any preacher been suspended conformably to the method prescribed in THE PLAN OF PACIFICATION? Is it not the uniform practice of District Meetings to arraign, to try, to *suspend* preachers by the sole and exclusive authority of the Preachers? That such has long been the practice is impossible to deny. And that the *practice* is contrary to the *law* of the Body, is equally certain. This, therefore, is one of the evils which *negligence* has allowed to grow into pernicious custom, against wholesome law, and christian liberty! Nor is it difficult to discover, how stealthy practice has encroached upon the rights both of the People, and of the Preachers. It was at the instance of THE PEOPLE, that "THE ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT FOR GENERAL PACIFICATION," were drawn up, "in order to establish," (as the Conference then assembled at Manchester expressed themselves) "a general and lasting peace and union throughout our Connexion:"—and, in the conclusion, under the word, ADDENDA, the Conference subjoined these remarkable words; "We have in some degree, deposited our characters and usefulness in your hands, or the hands of your representatives, by making them JUDGES OF OUR MORALS, DOCTRINES, AND GIFTS."

That concessions, *reluctantly* yielded by the leading preachers of that day, at the urgent requirement of the people, were not likely to be long efficacious, if the practice of Methodist law were confided wholly to the preachers, without a vigilant supervision of the people; is perfectly natural to suppose. Nor, knowing the frailty common to human nature, ought we to be too severe in censuring what might, perhaps, have befallen

ourselves.—That *negligence* on the part of the people to preserve what had been acquired with difficulty, was, in this instance, likely to lead, on the part of the preachers, to a recurrence to habits which former practice had rendered agreeable, was next to certain. And such was the fact. Through negligence of the people, a noble Constitution has been suffered to sink into desuetude. An abuse which was corrected has been renewed, and again requires reformation! Still, however, the *law* of the case admits of no dispute. In confirmation of which, the Deeds of most of our Chapels are drawn up conformably to the very document now in question, and in these words, “The said Trustees, for the time being, shall proceed according to the Rule in that case” [i. e. in reference to the *trial* and *suspension* of a preacher appointed by the Conference] provided in the Rules of Pacification in the Minutes of the Conference, held in the year 1795.” Such, *precisely*, are the terms on which the Wesley Chapel, in Oldham Road, Manchester, is settled; and from which, as well as from others in the Manchester Circuit, the Trustees have seen fit to expel me, without such a trial as “the Rules of Pacification” require!*

* To secure the utmost accuracy, the very words as they stand in the Deed of the Wesley Chapel, in Oldham Road, Manchester, are transcribed. —“Provided also that in case it shall appear to the Trustees for the time being, of the said trust estate and premises, or the major part of them, for the time being, that the doctrine of any Preacher or Preachers, so to be appointed as aforesaid, is contrary to the Notes or Sermons herein before mentioned, or that the same is erroneous, or that his or their conduct or abilities is or are immoral, or deficient. Then, and in such case, and as often as it shall so happen, they the said Trustees for the time being shall proceed according to the rule in that case provided in the Rules of Pacification, set forth in the Minutes of the Conference, held in the year *one thousand seven hundred and ninety five*.”

ONLY a few words remain to be said respecting some of the consequences of the rash, and unconstitutional proceeding of the Manchester District Meeting. The first was, that of the forcible assumption of my office, as the lawful Superintendent of the Manchester First Circuit, by the Rev. Robert Newton. Having been informed of his intention, previous to his actual usurpation, I sent him the following document, to admonish him of his peril, should he persist in doing so :—

Manchester, Oct. 25, 1834.

Sir,

Having heard, from what I deem to be unquestionable authority, that you purpose coming into my Circuit with an intention to officiate in my place, *without my consent* ; I take this opportunity to inform you,—That I shall consider any act of public duty performed by you, or by any of your Deputies, in my Circuit, whether in the administration of God's holy Word, and Ordinances ; or presiding in any Official Meetings, whether of the Societies, or Circuit, a direct violation of the rights and privileges confided to me by the last Conference, and an unwarrantable intrusion into a Circuit not your own, to the fearful risk of disturbing the harmony, peace, and prosperity, of so important a portion of Methodism as the Manchester First Circuit, and of creating confusion, anarchy, and division.—I am, Sir,

Your's, &c.

SAMUEL WARREN.

*To the Rev. Robert Newton,
Chairman of the Manchester District.*

Consequent upon Mr. Newton's disregard of my admonition, a deputation of the Trustees of the Oldham-Street Chapel, led on by the ill advised measures of the

District Meeting, waited upon me, to forbid me any longer the use of the pulpit. And on Monday, the 27th of October, I was duly served with the following legal ejection from my pulpit, and from the entire premises. The following is a copy of the document:—

To the Reverend Samuel Warren.

We the undersigned, being the major part of the Trustees, for the time being, of the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, situate in and near Oldham-Street and Dale-Street, in Manchester, and of the Morning Chapel, class-rooms, and other rooms and appurtenances thereunto adjoining and usually held and occupied therewith, do hereby give you notice, that we require and demand of you not to preach in, or, in any manner whatsoever, occupy, the same chapels, class-rooms, and premises, nor to hold, or preside at, any meetings therein, nor, in any wise, to act or interfere in or about the same premises, in the capacity of the Superintendent of the Circuit, in which the same premises are situate, or in any other ministerial or official capacity whatsoever. And we do hereby give you notice that, in case of your non-compliance with any of the requirements and demands herein contained, legal proceedings will be forthwith commenced against you, without farther notice. Dated this twenty seventh day of October, 1834.

JOHN BURTON,
JOHN MARSDEN,
JAMES WOOD,
JOHN LOMAS,
JOSHUA REA,
ROBERT HENSON,
W. F. JOHNSON.

. On the sixth day of November, I received a similar legal document forbidding my further use of the Chapel

and Premises, situate in Blackley. Signed also as under:—

JOHN BURTON,
GEORGE BURTON,
JOHN DOWNES,
ROBERT OUGHTON,
JOHN MARSDEN.

And, on the twenty-fifth of November, by order of a Meeting called by Trustees of the Wesley Chapel, I was served with a prohibition to preach in future in that Chapel.

The effect produced by this harsh and injurious treatment, upon the pious and affectionate Congregations through the Circuit, may be better conceived than described. Attempt after attempt has been made, by those who have seen proper to support the above measures, to invalidate my statements, but without having succeeded in any one instance to establish the contrary, or in the least to shake any position which I have taken. The crooked ways in which they have gone about to attain their ends, I now leave to the public rightly to estimate, and to answer for their conduct to a higher tribunal than the judgment of man. One circumstance, however, I cannot but mention as occasioning me especial sorrow,—as infixing a barbed arrow in the kindest feelings of my heart; and that is, that my two affectionate Colleagues, the Rev. John Hanwell, and the Rev. Jonathan Crowther, with whom, up to the moment of the District Meeting, I had been on terms of the dearest friendship, seduced from their allegiance to me, have acknowledged the *Usurper*, as their Superintendent, instead of me. Nor has either of them since honoured me with a call, (except to deliver a formal message) to sympathize with me in my distress, or to afford me the least counsel or assistance! Nay, the world has been called to witness, that Jonathan Crowther, my former

friend, though so much my junior, and even a junior to Mr. Hanwell, volunteered to carry on the most determined hostility against his own Superintendent; and, having "whetted his tongue like a sword, and bent his bow to shoot his arrows; even *bitter words*," has done *his* utmost to effect my ruin. Nor is it a slight aggravation of my grief, that my own Colleagues should have shewn themselves the most eager in the whole District Meeting, to depose me from my office in favour of the Rev. Robert Newton. To support the truth of this statement, I shall quote the very words of the President himself, in a letter to the Circuit Stewards of my Circuit:—"His (Mr. Newton's) appointment was at the earnest request of Messrs. Hanwell and Crowther."

The extent to which my character has suffered, as a fellow-helper, in the estimation of my christian Brethren, through the violent measures resorted to by the District Meeting, knows no other limits than the wide circumference of the Methodist Connexion, at home and abroad. Which way soever I turn myself, I meet with a positive refusal from my Brethren in the Ministry to enter any of their pulpits, having been denounced as no longer deserving to be tolerated as a Christian Minister in the Body. Nor will this appear strange, when the Wesleyan People are informed, how the *pen*, as well as the *tongue* of slander, has been *secretly* at work to blast my reputation, and stab me "in the house of my friends!" The following is a faithful copy of a Note, round the margin of a Circular, by the Rev. Edmund Grindrod. [The date of the Post-mark, Nov. 5,-34.] directed to the Rev. Peter Mc. Owen, of Glasgow; and by him circulated among a Society, greatly endeared to me, by having laboured with extraordinary success among them, during three of the happiest years of my life.

"My dear Brother,

This printed Circular will give you some idea of the state we are brought into in this populous Town, by, I am sorry to say, AN UNPRINCIPLED MAN. At the adjourned Quarterly Meeting, held at Oldham-Street, before he was suspended, Dr. W. allowed the most anti-Methodistical discussions to take place of which I ever heard; and applauded in the most flattering terms the expression of sentiments, in direct hostility to our established discipline, without the slightest rebuke. He permitted a strong faction in the Meeting to hiss his faithful Colleague, Mr. Crowther, for withstanding him; and having to leave the Meeting for a short time, he gave the chair to one of the Stewards, in the presence of his Colleague. He is really in a state of open rebellion against our laws, holding meetings of Leaders in a Sunday School, where Resolutions subversive of Methodism are passed. Last night they held a Meeting, with him at their head, at the very time Mr. Newton was holding the regular Leaders' Meeting in the Stewards' room. Dr. W. and his party resolved, that the Leaders should continue to meet their Classes as usual, pay their money there, and that their Steward should pay Dr. W's. Board, and also that of Messrs. Hanwell and Crowther. And yet, notwithstanding, Dr. W. asserts he will never leave the Methodists. Two of their Resolutions are, Vote by Ballot, and Admission of Laymen into Conference. It is manifest that their object is to bring the Church into bondage to this world's politics; and this design must be resisted at all hazards. The *Preachers* in all the Manchester Circuits are all of *one mind*, and our friends are rallying round us. We are *contending for holy principles*, and God is with us. The first loss at Oldham-Street will probably be great, but in the other Circuits we do not expect

much loss. Rochdale and Dudley are very corrupt, and from Liverpool the Doctor calculates upon some support. *Alas!* for him, he has put himself into the hands of men, many of whom care not a straw for him, any farther than he may serve their party purposes. I have addressed the Leaders and Societies in this Circuit, and we have good hopes that almost all of them will prove themselves steadfast in this day of trial and rebuke. Our Ministerial character has been assailed, and stained by the hand of a Brother, and our enemies are exulting. I mourn day and night in secret places before God, and fear that souls will be for ever lost through this one rash and wicked act of one whom I once loved as a Brother. Pray for us, &c."

"P. S.—I drew up the outline of this, and Brother *Crowther* has made it what it is."

✍ It is really lamentable to find in this curious document, which through a dear friend in Glasgow came into my possession, that some of the facts professed to be detailed, should have been so grossly misstated; and especially under the revising pen of the *Rev. Jonathan Crowther*, who was so capable of telling the facts just as they occurred, had they been to his credit. I shall animadvert only on two, which more immediately concerned himself. *First*, it is stated, that "I permitted a strong faction in the Meeting to hiss his faithful Colleague, Mr. Crowther."—The truth of the case is this: as it was in the knowledge of the very full Quarterly Meeting in question, that Mr. Crowther had just published a Pamphlet against his Superintendent, not remarkable for its sweetness of spirit; I was desirous that it should, notwithstanding, appear to the Meeting, that I did not cherish any unchristian feeling towards him. Upon his

entering the Meeting, I therefore most cordially presented my hand to him. To my surprise, he refused to accept of it. As his refusal attracted the notice of several of the Leaders, I was desirous, towards the close of the Meeting, to obviate, if possible, any thing which might leave an unfavourable opinion upon the minds of those who had witnessed his conduct; and determined that the same individuals before they separated should witness our cordiality. Having, therefore, first appealed to him, in the hearing of the Meeting, whether we had ever interchanged one unkind word with each other, during the whole time in which we had been associated in our blessed work; whether, on the contrary, the utmost friendship had not up to that moment been mutually shown towards each other,—to the truth of which he distinctly testified; I then remarked, that though he had seen proper to write a pamphlet against me, that was no reason why he should cherish personal hostility—that I cherished none whatever against him, and once more tendered him my hand. When, to my disappointment and grief, he *again* refused. *Then* it was, that the Meeting, under strong feelings of displacency towards Mr. Crowther, at a conduct which they thought ungenerous, and unchristian, began to express their displeasure in such words as, “shame—disgraceful”—and the like. Instead, however, of my “*permitting*” it, I endeavoured *instantly* to suppress it, (as every one present will bear me witness) by giving out a verse of a hymn, which was sung, and then concluded with prayer. The *next* thing worth notice is, That during only a *few moments* absence, “I gave the chair to one of the Stewards, in the presence of my Colleague.” My chief reason, I hesitate not to say, was this, that as Mr. Crowther had *previously* conducted himself in so unbecoming a manner in the presence of the Meeting, by

refusing me the token of ordinary civility, I did not think it my duty to lay myself liable to an additional insult, by hazarding his refusal to take the chair, whilst I was absent only for *a few seconds*; and therefore availed myself of the kindness of one of the Circuit Stewards.

HAVING given one instance in which the *secret pen* of slander, has been employed to injure me; I shall give one also of a *secret false tongue*, endeavouring to accomplish the same work, only by another instrument. This will sufficiently appear by giving a copy of a letter lately sent to a friend, in compliance with his reiterated importunity.

Manchester, 29th Nov. 1834.

Dear Sir,

I scarcely know whether *contempt*, or *pity*, is more suitable to express my sentiment, concerning a report which you say is in circulation respecting me in Macclesfield; viz. "That before I manifested any opposition to the Wesleyan Theological Institution, I wrote a letter to one of the Preachers, requesting my friend to use his influence in getting me elected to the Senior Secretaryship of the Missionary Society, in case Mr. Bunting should be appointed to the office of President of the Theological Institution." This, you say, is reported by "The Travelling Preachers in the Macclesfield Circuit," as having "just come to light."

Now, Sir, in behalf of my Christian Brethren in Macclesfield, I take in hand to say, that I am persuaded such a report cannot have originated with them; nor am I willing to believe them to be men capable of giving currency to so vile a falsehood, and assassin-like attack upon my character. Whoever may have been the villainous perpetrators, my reply is this,—"*They lie, and*

do not the truth." It will be easy for any one who doubts my word, to satisfy himself by requiring the production of the letter which I am said to have written.—Mark, I mean *in my own hand writing*: and even that must be *identified* to be what it pretends; as it is plain that the infamous villain who could propagate such a falsehood, is equally capable of *forgery*.

This scandal must be put to the same account as the other untruths which have been sent forth, whether by the Rev. Jonathan Crowther, the Rev. George Cubitt, or others.—I take this opportunity, once for all, to state; that having, I am persuaded, sufficiently supported my claim to veracity in all my statements before the Public, against the falsehoods industriously propagated to "take away my good name," I hope I shall not find it necessary to give any more written answers to such anonymous slanders as that which you have kindly communicated to me.—I am, dear Sir,

Your's most respectfully,

SAMUEL WARREN.

To Mr. — Sharrocks,
Manchester.

Before entirely quitting the exposition of the *base* methods resorted to by the opposite side, in order to support the faction which has conspired to overwhelm the cause of TRUTH, and LIBERTY, I will add only one more instance, from a pamphlet just published by a person of the name of WILLIAM READ; who, in the commencement of it regrets "the events and proceedings," which have "*drawn him from that retirement he so highly values, and which he has relinquished with deep regret!*" Probably he will not be the *only* person—probably his friends also will "deeply regret," that he did not rather restrict himself to the retirement of his *shop and counter*,

where it is said that his conduct meets general approbation.—This WILLIAM READ, has seen fit, on the present occasion, to make his appearance as an Author. He is said to be very intimate with the Reverend Jonathan Crowther, and it is therefore reasonable to suppose, that so important an era in his life, as that in which he undertakes to publish A PAMPHLET, would not be ushered in without the flourish of such a *trumpeter* as the *Reverend Jonathan Crowther*, and that his pamphlet would scarcely have seen the light, without the supervision of his *learned* friend—his *Magnus Apollo*. Still there is, I confess, some reason to entertain doubts on this subject, from the *many* inaccuracies which were in the power of his friend to have corrected, had he been disposed to do so.—This said WILLIAM READ, however, has actually written in his pamphlet, that at a *private* interview with the Rev. Jonathan Crowther, “Dr. Warren explicitly acknowledged *the wrong* done by him, in not having acted consistently towards his Colleague, and thus a good understanding, on this subject at least, was once more effected.”—Now I tell this daring and imprudent adventurer into affairs above his hand, that no such concession whatever as he has had the *audacity* to publish as *truth*, was ever made by me to Mr. Crowther. On the contrary, the interview, which was *sought* by Mr. Crowther for explanation, was altogether such, both as to manner and expression on *his* part, as most emphatically expressed how deeply *he* regretted the occurrence of his having refused to accept in public my hand, offered to him in friendship. Upon which I did instantly, in my parlour, and again on his leaving my door, give him my hand with my heart, and hoped thenceforward that nothing would ever bring his sincerity under suspicion. I refer this WILLIAM READ to the Rev. Jonathan Crowther, to verify my statement as strictly correct; and

challenge the latter Gentleman, between God and his own conscience, to deny, if he dare, its *truth*!" These base slanders, hardships, and privations, I cheerfully submit to, supported by the imperturbable consciousness of truth and integrity; without entertaining, I trust, one unchristian temper towards those who have so deeply injured me. They have done so, I am ready to believe, unwittingly, and I can instantly forgive them, and take them to my heart, the moment they see and acknowledge their error.

That the Societies in this Circuit have not been torn in pieces, and the Chapels deserted, or become scenes of confusion and riot, is to be attributed, in the first place, to the goodness and mercy of God; and in the next place, to the enlightened and steady piety with which the Societies and Congregations of the Manchester First Circuit are so deeply imbued, and their unshaken adherence to the CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES of our blessed Connexion. They rest in the assured persuasion, that there is still left in the Body, sufficient CONSERVATIVE VIGOUR, to rectify those abuses which have grown up with exorbitant power, and perversion of privilege, when once THE PEOPLE assert their LEGITIMATE RIGHTS.

IN CONCLUSION, let the judicious and pious members of our Societies throughout our Connexion say, whether the rapid strides lately made towards UNIVERSAL DESPOTISM, by one party in the Conference, could much longer have been endured by any lover of CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, whether of THE PREACHERS, or of THE PEOPLE! When expulsions from our Societies by hundreds, and by thousands are taking place, by means of NEW TESTS and UNCONSTITUTIONAL measures,—as in the infamous case of Leeds in 1827; when the People are

no longer allowed by their Superintendents to express their opinions in their Quarter Days, upon subjects strictly constitutional, or make known their just complaints and grievances through them to the Conference, or should they even reach that Assembly, by it to be disregarded; when Preachers are brought to trial, one after another, before SECRET DISTRICT MEETINGS, and, being convicted,—not of false doctrine, immorality, or want of ability, but of exercising the right of private judgment on political subjects, or of honestly expressing their fears on subjects which involve the dearest religious interests both of THE PEOPLE, and of THE PREACHERS;—they are suspended from the exercise of their Ministerial Functions, or virtually expelled from the Connexion :—when these deeds are daringly perpetrated in defiance of the most SOLEMN COMPACT and PLEDGE which the Conference ever conceded to THE PEOPLE,—and perpetrated under the shameless profession of acting *Constitutionally*; is it not time to demand an adjustment of the balance by which even-handed Justice shall weigh out, both to THE PEOPLE, and to THE PREACHERS, what is righteously their due?

Whatever opinion may be entertained respecting my right, *as a Member of the Hundred*, who compose the legal Conference, to be fairly heard on any subject which I deem of vital importance to the welfare of the Connexion; and, consequently, the right of refuting *at the time* of my address, any aspersions cast upon my character and motives tending to invalidate my statements,—and especially after I had given a solemn declaration to the Chair,—“That as I had been refused the justice of vindicating myself, and my cause, against calumny, before that Assembly, *I should reserve to myself the right of doing so in whatever other method I might think proper* :”—to which declaration, *not one word of reply was*

uttered by the Chair; nor, consequently, as has been *shamelessly* asserted by the Reverend Jónathan Crowther in his pamphlet, that “*I was plainly* told I might have a separate investigation if I thought proper,” of the subject of my complaint! No reference whatever, either at the time I uttered my declaration, or at any subsequent period of the Conference being made, as to any such method of adjustment, or appeal. *This I most solemnly aver!*—DENY IT WHO DARE!—Whatever, I say, may be any private opinion, or public expression, as to my *right* of being heard, as I again, and again demanded, in justice to the PUBLIC CAUSE I was advocating, much more than to my PRIVATE CHARACTER! there can be little, if any room, to hesitate on the following question, Why the bringing forward into *speedy accomplishment*, of what has been aptly enough called “Mr. Bunting’s *pet* measure of a College,” was so long delayed after he was known to have devised it?—That *such* a measure, under *such* auspices, was the readiest way to acquire unlimited power, and PERPETUAL DICTATORSHIP—especially when *conjoined* with the SENIOR SECRETARYSHIP OF OUR FOREIGN MISSIONS, must be obvious to every one!—Why, then, was this *master stroke* of policy, for obtaining the sole Despotie Government of the Wesleyan Connexion, so long delayed?—The answer to this question will readily be found in the lamented extinction, by death, of those two resplendent luminaries in the Methodistic Hemisphere, THE REV. DR. CLARKE, and THE REV. RICHARD WATSON; the only two Preachers who were thought competent to check Mr. Bunting’s headlong measures, and assert an independent judgment. Scarcely were these excellent men consigned to the tomb, when the proposal of this College, under the suspicious, the forbidding, the rash, the unconstitutional measures which have been detailed, were forced upon the Con-

nexion. Whatever might have been the *former* views of Dr. Clarke, relative to some sort of an Institution for our Junior Preachers, unattended with the perils of the *present* Dynasty, I am authorized by Mrs. Clarke herself, and her Family, to say, that he was of late, and to his latest hour, most avowedly hostile to such an Institution as the present. And in reference to Mr. Watson, every one who knew him will give him credit for so much independence as to believe, that had he survived to witness the recklessness with which the present Institution has been urged forward, regardless of the opinions of THE PEOPLE, and in violation of A SOLEMN COMPACT between them and the Conference; he would sooner have forfeited his place in the Wesleyan Connexion, than [p]andered to such a voracious appetite for power and dominion over one of the noblest, and most generous People under Heaven!

In the present agitated state of the Methodist Connexion, the object of all others most important to be secured, is the maintenance of its UNITY! So long as the integrity of the Constitution, as given in the years 1795, and 1797, is preserved inviolate, what reason can be shewn, why, in the present contest, either one side or the other, should entertain for a moment the purpose of SEPARATION? Should there, on the contrary, be a determination on one side, to substitute *modern practice*, instead of the *original Compact*; on THEM be the blame of promoting the principles of disaffection and division! Whatever may be THEIR determination, and how deeply soever we may deplore such a proceeding, and the loss to the Body of Brethren whom we sincerely love and respect; WE are resolved, by the grace of God, never to quit the foundation on which the fabric of our noble Connexion rests. The storm of conflicting passions, and the lust of power,

may, for a time, beat vehemently upon the building, but the tempest ere long will cease. The needless fears of those who have had resolution enough to remain under its roof, will speedily subside. A long duration of internal peace, and spiritual prosperity will succeed. Generations yet unborn will gratefully applaud the noble stand made at the present crisis, to preserve our incomparable Constitution from falling into decay and ruin. With holy exultation will they rehearse the triumph of CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, over a cruel and reckless DESPOTISM; and point to the impregnable fortress which the piety and the valour of THE PEOPLE rescued from destruction, with the honest pride of the ancient Israelites, when they challenged the whole world to produce any thing equal to their present privileges, and everlasting hopes:—"Walk about Zion, and go round about her; tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generations following. For this God is our God for ever and ever: he will be our guide even unto death."

APPENDIX.

I have just received a Letter from the Rev. James Bromley, relative to the *very words* employed by the Rev. Edmund Grindrod, on refusing leave for the former to sit by him, in the celebrated Manchester District Meeting. This would not have appeared in the present place, but for the *unaccountable imprudence* of Mr.

Grindrod in publishing a letter on the subject, in the Manchester Times of last Saturday, Nov. 29, 1834.

(Copy.)

My dear Doctor,

I have read with surprise in the Manchester Times of Saturday last, a letter from Mr. Grindrod, relative to one of the incidents in the proceedings of the Special District Meeting held on your case. The facts of the matter, to the best of my recollection, are simply these:—When the Meeting objected to my sitting by your side, I offered to Mr. Burt, who sat between me and Mr. Grindrod, to change places with him. Mr. Burt immediately rose, and was moving from his place to accommodate me with it, when Mr. Grindrod also rose, and said to him, “No, no ! he shall not sit by me.”* Repulsed by this declaration, I instantly retired, and took a seat in another part of the room. If any thing was said by Mr. Grindrod about his “papers,” it must have been when I had removed, as nothing of that kind was heard by me. It is indeed not improbable, that Mr. Grindrod, in justification of an act, to say the least of it, so discourteous, did, when I had retired to a greater distance, mention his papers as a reason for not allowing

* As, at the moment this transaction took place, my exclusive attention was fixed upon Mr. Grindrod’s conduct, and being the next person but two to him, I had the most perfect knowledge of what passed, I could safely *upon oath* attest, that the very words written by Mr. Bromley, were those which Mr. Grindrod uttered on this occasion ; (*not* those published in the *Times* of last Saturday)—they also agree perfectly with what I have upon previous record in my own hand writing ;—and with the recollection of several members of my family, to whom both Mr. Bromley and myself related this disgraceful circumstance, immediately after retiring from the District Meeting.

SAMUEL WARREN.

me to be seated near him.—The term “snappishly” by no means answers to the *manner* of Mr. Grindrod in making the above assertion, as that manner impressed me at the time. To my apprehension at the time, there was an *earnestness of distaste* in Mr. Grindrod’s manner, which affected me more painfully, more deeply, than any mere *snappishness* could do! As, however, my mind might possibly be awakened to unusual sensitiveness by the extraordinary scene I was called to witness, I am ready to admit that the impression made at the moment was perhaps excessive, and to some extent incorrect. A disavowal of personal unkindness on the part of Mr. Grindrod, would on this very account, be most welcome to me!

But what construction am I to put on Mr. Grindrod’s *own account* of the transaction, in this published letter? “No, you must excuse me, I have my papers here before me—I do not wish to change my companion.” And so Mr. Grindrod, not only insinuates in the District Meeting, but now publishes the insinuation to the world, that he could not permit me to sit near him, *lest I should overlook his papers!!* Truly, my dear Doctor, whatever the celebrated District Meeting may do to *you*, I think it seems determined that *I* shall feel the consequences of its displeasure! Judging by the conduct adopted towards me, by your Special District Meeting, I must indeed be a bad and obnoxious man! *First*, they expel me by a solemn vote from their Meeting! In the *next place*, the Chairman, Mr. Newton, with the Brethren, Crowther and Hanwell, attests a public document, in which it is declared, that “my *exclusion* was the merited result of my own *contemptuous* and *insulting* behaviour!” as though, to be sure, I had brow-beaten the President; interrupted the speakers; railed and vociferated; or by some other obstreperous proceedings, had thrown the

Meeting into confusion ! Whereas I call upon you, Dr. Warren, and upon every Brother present, to witness,—whether I ever once addressed the Meeting ? whether I ever offered the least resistance to any one of its most extraordinary resolutions concerning me ? and whether my whole behaviour on that unexampled occasion was not silent, solemn, and respectful ? If the sentiment to which I gave utterance in a *whisper*, and which I have publicly acknowledged, is deemed an exception, it can only be in the estimation of a partisan. And now to finish the series of unkind, unbrotherly, unfounded imputations, I learn from this published letter of Mr. Grindrod, that an insinuation is placed upon the Minutes of a subsequent District Meeting, That I *entertained a design of clandestinely overlooking the papers of another !!*

You have my free consent to use the foregoing communication in any way, that to your wisdom seems the best. I have indeed no wish to appear as a literary controvertist in the Manchester question, as it is significantly styled ; but I venerate truth, and dare not renounce my allegiance to her, because friends—brethren—officialities—assemblies—communities, happen, through passion, or through inattention, or perhaps through both, to be marshalled against her ! She is great, and in the end must prevail !—I remain, my dear Doctor,

Your affectionate Brother,

JAMES BROMLEY.

York, 2nd December, 1834.
The Rev. Samuel Warren, LL. D.,
Manchester.

It is thought proper to subjoin in this place, the names of the Preachers stationed in the Manchester

District, as they stand upon the Minutes of the last Conference.

Samuel Warren, John Hanwell, Jonathan Crowther ; Edward Gibbons, John Thompson, Supernumeraries. Edmund Grindrod, Thomas H. Squance, Charles Prest ; John Taylor, Supernumerary. John Anderson, Robert Newton, Robert L. Lusher, John Bedford ; Jonathan Barker, Supernumerary. Joseph Hollingworth, Israel Holgate, George Steward ; John Bartley, Welsh Preacher ; William Shelmerdine, Supernumerary. Wm. Burt, Francis A. West, George Osborn. William Mc. Kitrick, Thomas Pennington. Thomas Hardy, Thomas Capp. Thomas Hill, William Ricketts. William Woolsey, George Turner. Richard Tabraham.

Robert Newton, *Chairman of the District.*

Messrs. J. Barker, J. Thompson, J. Taylor, and R. Tabraham, it is believed were not present at the Special District Meeting.

Lately published, in One Volume, 12mo. price 5s. neatly bound in cambric, gilt lettered, **SERMONS** on Various Subjects. By Samuel Warren, LL. D.

Also, by the same Author; *Second Edition*, lately published, in one Volume, 12mo., price 5s. neatly bound in cambric, gilt lettered, **MEMOIRS** and **SELECT LETTERS**, of Mrs. Anne Warren; with **Biographical Sketches** of her Family.

Also, **REMARKS** on the Wesleyan Theological Institution, for the Education of the Junior Preachers; together with the Substance of a Speech, delivered on the subject in the London Conference of 1834. (Third Edition, with an Appendix.) Price 9d. Octavo. By the same **AUTHOR**.

Also, **AN APPENDIX** to the **Remarks** on the Wesleyan Theological Institution; being a **Sufficient Answer** to the Rev. Jonathan Crowther's, and the Rev. George Cubitt's Pamphlets on the Subject. Price 1d. Octavo. By the same **AUTHOR**.

Also, **A MORE** than "**SUFFICIENT ANSWER**" to the Rev. George Cubitt's Pamphlet. Price 1d. Octavo. By the same **AUTHOR**.

London: Published by **SIMPKIN** and **MARSHALL**. Sold at the **TIMES OFFICE**, Manchester; and by all other Booksellers.

BW401
.W3A3